IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.RAMKUMAR

WEDNESDAY, THE 18TH JULY 2007 / 27TH ASHADHA 1929

Crl.Rev.Pet.No. 2311 of 2005(D)

CRA.476/04 OF IV ADDL.SESSIONS COURT, ERNAKULAM
CC.569/98 OF JFCM, MUVATTUPUZHA

REVN. PETITIONER:

P.V. ANDREWS, S/O. VARGHESE,
POOVAN HOUSE, COLLEGE ROAD,
MUVATTUPUZHA.

BY ADV. SMT.P.V.KOCHUTHRESIA

RESPONDENTS:

---

1. RAJU VARGHESE, PULIYANATTU HOUSE,
SOUTH MARADY, MUVATTUPUZHA.

2. STATE OF KERALA, REPRESENTED BY
PUBLIC PROSECUTOR, ERNAKULAM.

BY ADV. SRI.T.A.UNNIKRISHNAN SRI.K.S.SIVAKUMAR

THIS CRIMINAL REVISION PETITION HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 18/07/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

V. RAMKUMAR, J.

Crl. R.P. No. 2311 OF 2005 D

Dated this the 18th day of July, 2007

O R D E R

In this Revision filed under Section 397 read with Sec. 401 Cr.P.C. the petitioner who was the accused in C.C. No.569/1998 on the file of the J.F.C.M., Muvattupuzha challenges the conviction entered and the sentence passed against him for an offence punishable under Sec. 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act').

2. I heard the learned counsel for the Revision Petitioner and the learned Public Prosecutor.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the Revision Petitioner re-iterated the contentions in support of the Revision. The courts below have concurrently held that the cheque in question was drawn by the revision petitioner in favour of the complainant on the drawee bank, that the cheque was validly presented to the bank, that it was dishonoured for reasons which fall under Section 138 of the Act, that the complainant made a demand for payment by a notice in time in accordance with clause (b) of the proviso to Section 138 of the Act and that the Revision Petitioner/accused failed to make the payment within 15 days of receipt of the statutory notice. Both the courts have considered and rejected the defence set up by the revision petitioner while entering the above finding. The said finding has been recorded

on an appreciation of the oral and documentary evidence. I do not find any error, illegality or impropriety in the finding so recorded concurrently by the courts below. The conviction was thus rightly entered against the petitioner.

4. What now survives for consideration is the question as to whether a proper sentence has been imposed on the Revision Petitioner. I am, however, inclined to modify the sentence imposed on the revision petitioner provided he complies with the condition hereinafter mentioned. Accordingly, if the revision petitioner pays to the 1st respondent complainant by way of compensation under section 357 (3) Cr.P.C. a sum of Rs.15,000/- (Rupees fifteen thousand only) within thirty days from today, then he need to undergo only imprisonment till the rising of the court. If on the other hand, the revision petitioner commits default in making the payment as aforesaid, he shall undergo simple imprisonment for three months by way of default sentence. Money, if any, paid by the revision petitioner pursuant to the orders, if any, passed by the lower appellate court shall be refunded to the revision petitioner.

This Revision is disposed of confirming the conviction but modifying the sentence as above.

(V. RAMKUMAR, JUDGE)

aks